

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending with claims 1, 4, 15, 16, and 18 being independent. Claims 33-53 were previously canceled.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of applicant's proposed amendment to claim 1, which was faxed to the Examiner today. This reply incorporates this proposed amendment to claim 1.

Applicant also acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 15-32. The Examiner has stated that the "present invention is directed to specifying that speech (words or phrases) which is to be corrected as a result of mis-recognition." To clarify, claims 15-32 are each directed to combinations of different features that are not shown in the cited art, alone or in combination.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract as exceeding 150 words. The abstract has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 for containing the word "not." Applicant has amended claim 1 to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection because claim 1 has been amended to recite "the portion of the recognition result replaced ... includes at least one word other than the user-selected word." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 25, lines 10-22 and Figs. 12 and 14-16 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, applicant requests allowance of claim 1. Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Entry of this amendment is believed proper under 37 CFR §1.116 and MPEP §714.13 because the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal. The foregoing amendments were not earlier presented because it was earnestly believed that the claims on file were already in condition for allowance. Moreover, it is believed that entry of this amendment would not present new issues requiring further

Applicant : Daniell Stevens et al.  
Serial No. : 09/845,769  
Filed : May 2, 2001  
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 13865-074001

consideration or search in view of the Examiner's familiarity with this application and in view of the fact that the claims were not rejected over prior art and have been amended to more clearly recite features that the Examiner has already considered.

Enclosed is a \$110.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 10, 2004

Diana DiBerardino  
Diana DiBerardino  
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40227722.doc